

and 27-28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Griesemer in view of Yokote (U.S. Patent No. 6,138,140). Claims 9, 19 and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Griesemer in view of Yokote, and further in view of Aditham (U.S. Patent No. 6,378,001). Claims 10, 20 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Griesemer in view of Yokote, and further in view of Nakai (U.S. Patent No. 6,253,248). Applicant submits the following in traversal of the rejections.

***Rejection of claims 1-3, 11-13 and 21-23 under § 102(e)
as being anticipated by Griesemer***

The Examiner asserts that verifying that the received object is of the saved predicted receiver type teaches “determining a type of the received input object” as recited in claim 1. In addition, the Examiner asserts that results showing that class A is the stored receiver type describes “ascertaining whether the received input object satisfies one or more predefined requirements” as further recited in claim 1. However, at no point in Grieserman would it be ascertained, based on a determined type (saved predicted receiver type as cited by the Examiner), whether the received input objects satisfies one or more predefined requirements (result shows that class A is the stored receiver type). In particular, if an object were determined to be of a saved predicted type, then the object would not be of a stored receiver type (predefined requirements). Consequently, an input function on a computer would never be executed, since the object, which is of a saved predicted receiver type, would never satisfy the predefined requirement (stored receiver type) as cited by the Examiner.

For the above reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be deemed patentable. Since claims 11 and 21 describe similar elements, claims 11 and 21 and their dependent claims also have not been anticipated by Griesemer.

***Rejection of claims 4-6, 14-16, and 24-26 under § 103(a)
as being unpatentable over Griesemer in view of Allen***

Claims 4-6, 14-16, and 24-26 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Griesemer in view of Allen. However, Allen (Reel 009907, Frame 0172, Date recorded 4/14/1999) has a common assignee with the current application (Reel 010318, Frame 0955, Date recorded 10/18/1999) and the subject matter of Allen and the claimed invention were subject to a common obligation of assignment pursuant to MPEP 706.02(l)(2) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(c). This demonstration of common obligation of assignment removes Allen as a reference, which will overcome the obviousness rejection of claims 4-6, 14-16, and 24-26.

***Rejection of claims 7-8, 17-18 and 27-28 under § 103(a)
as being unpatentable over Griesemer in view of Yokote***

Claims 7-8, 17-18, and 27-28 should be deemed patentable by virtue of their dependency to independent claims 1, 11 and 21 for the reasons set forth above. Furthermore, Yokote does not cure the deficiencies of Griesemer.

***Rejection of claims 9, 19 and 29 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable
over Griesemer in view of Yokote, and further in view of Aditham***

Claims 9, 19 and 29 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Griesemer in view of Yokote, and further in view of Aditham. However, Aditham (Reel 008960, Frame 0185, Date recorded 1/28/1999) has a common assignee with the current application (Reel 010318, Frame 0955, Date recorded 10/18/1999) and the subject matter of Aditham and the claimed invention

were subject to a common obligation of assignment pursuant to MPEP 706.02(1)(2) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(c). This demonstration of common obligation of assignment removes Aditham as a reference, which will overcome the obviousness rejection of claims 9, 19 and 29.

***Rejection of claims 10, 20 and 30 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable
over Griesemer in view of Yokote, and further in view of Nakai***

Claims 10, 20 and 30 should be deemed patentable by virtue of their dependency to independent claims 1, 11 and 21 for the reasons set forth above. Furthermore, neither Yokote nor Nakai cure the deficiencies of Griesemer.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Ruthleen E. Uy
Registration No. 51,361

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 25, 2004